



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,074	05/06/2005	Cornelis Versluys	NL021127US	2778

24737 7590 07/17/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

GREEN, TRACEY Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/534,074

Applicant(s)

VERSLUIJS, CORNELIS

Examiner

TRACIE Y. GREEN

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's amendment filed 04/24/2008. Claims 1-9 are pending and an action on the merits is as follows.
2. Applicant's amendments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot. No new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fields et al (US Patent 5,466,981)

Regarding claim 1, Field et al discloses, (Figure 1)

molding a hollow reflector body (10) having an optical axis (not shown) (Examiner takes the position that the optical axis of the prior art reference begins at the tip (46) and runs through the center of the light source, parallel to the light source (18) and having a neck-shaped (24) portion with a transverse wall (38) provided with at least one opening (40,41); providing a light source (18) and arranging the light source (18) in the reflector body(10); electrically connecting (34,36) the light source (18) to a lamp cap (16) provided with contacts (42,44) and with a current conductor (34, 52) comprising a

Art Unit: 2879

pliable material which conductor is passed through the opening (40) in the transverse wall (38); characterized by a step of securing the position of the light source in at least one longitudinal direction in that the conductor (52) is bent around and in is in direct contact. at least a portion of the outer transverse wall(38) (Column 3, lines 55-56)

(Examiner note: prior art reference states that 52 is joined to 16 which is part of the outer wall (38), thus this limitation has been met).

Regarding claim 2, Field et al teaches (Figure 1) characterized in that the position of the light source (18) is secured so as to be parallel to the direction of the optical axis by means of a mounting member (20).

Regarding claim 3, Field et al teaches the process characterized by a step of securing the position (column 3, lines 5-12) of the light source (18) in the longitudinal direction in that the mounting member (20) is made to rest on the inner conical contour of the neck (24).

Regarding claim 4, Field et al teaches (Figure 2) the process characterized by a step of pulling (Column 3, lines 55-60) the light source in the reflector neck.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al (US Patent 5,466,981) in view of Vercelotti (US 4,156,271).

Regarding Claim 5, Fields et al. teaches the reflector lamp set forth above (see rejection claim 1). Field et al. is silent regarding that at least one of the conductors is bent through a sharp angle of approximately 90°, so as to lock the light source in the axial direction

In the same field of endeavor of reflector lamps Vercelotti (Figure 1) teaches that at least one of the conductors (21) is bent through a sharp angle of approximately 90°, so as to lock the light source (11) in the axial direction in order to provide a device with improved control of the light source for better luminous output.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the reflector lamp of Fields et al. with at least one of the conductors is bent through a sharp angle of approximately 90°, so as to lock the light source in the axial direction in order to provide a device with improved control of the light source for better luminous output as taught by Vercelotti.

Regarding claim 6, Field et al. teaches a hollow molded reflector body (10) having an optical axis and having a neck-shaped portion (24) with a transverse wall (38) provided with at least one opening (40,41); a lamp cap (16) provided with contacts (*threaded portion of 16 and 46, which connects to the tip portion of (16) and connected to the neck-shaped portion (24)*); a light source (18) in a lamp vessel with a seal, arranged in the reflector body and electrically connected to the contacts (*threaded portion of 16 and 46 which is the diode connection to the base*) of the lamp cap by (16) means of current

conductors (34,36) that comprise a pliable material and are passed through the opening (40,41) in the transverse wall; a metal mounting member (20) for securing the position of the light source (18) in the optical axis direction, and mounted in the neck-shaped portion (24), a securing means for securing the position of the light source in at least one longitudinal direction characterized in that, said current conductor (34,52) forms the securing means (Column 3, lines 5-10) and in is in direct contact. at least a portion of the outer transverse wall(38). (Paragraph Column 3, lines 5-14).

Fields et al is lacks the seal of the lamp vessel.

In the same field of endeavor of reflector lamps Vercelloti (Figure 1) teaches the seal of the lamp vessel (11) in order to provide an improved low power light source (Column 1, lines 40-43).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the reflector lamp of Fields et al with a seal of the lamp vessel in order to provide an improved low power light source as taught by Vercelloti.

Regarding claim 7, Field et al. teaches, a bend in the conductor (52) so that the conductor (52) is at least partially adjacent to the outer transverse wall (38).

Regarding claim 8, Field et al teaches the conductor comprises a deformable material. *(Examiner note; examiner takes the position that since Field et al shows (52) a conductor which can be bent the material must be able to be deformed thus meeting the limitation of this claim)*

Regarding claim 9, Field et al. is silent regarding a sharp bend in the conductor of approximately 90°.

In the same field of endeavor of reflector lamps Vercelloti (Figure 1) teaches a sharp bend in the conductor of approximately 90°. in order to provide a device with improved control of the light source for better luminous output.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the reflector lamp of Fields et al. with a sharp bend in the conductor of approximately 90° in order to provide a device with improved control of the light source for better luminous output as taught by Vercelloti.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 04/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, the applicant amended independent claims 1 and 6 to recite "and is in direct contact. at least a portion of the outer transverse wall," and argued that by this amendment it distinguishes from the prior art reference. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and draw the applicants attention to (Column 3, 55-56) in which the Field reference discusses the conductor (52) being integrally connected or in tension with the walls. Furthermore the prior art reference states that 52 is joined to 16 which is part of the outer wall (38). Examiner, In view of the cited column and figure one of the prior art reference, one of ordinary skill in the art could take the teachings of fields' conductor being integral with or touching the outer wall to provide a device which has better stability and elongated lifespan. No other claims discussed rejections remain the same.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **TRACIE Y. GREEN** whose telephone number is (571)270-3104. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on 571/272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/Tracie Y Green/
Examiner, Art Unit 2879

/Sikha Roy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879